

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Ernest Houston,
Plaintiff
v.
Clark County Ex Rel, et al.,
Defendants

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01705-JAD-BNW

Order Dismissing Action

Plaintiff Ernest Houston brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at Stewart and Mojave county jail.¹ On August 11, 2020, the magistrate judge ordered Houston to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* by a non-prisoner within 30 days.² The magistrate judge expressly warned him that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case.³ The deadline has passed, and Houston has not filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* by a non-prisoner.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.⁴ A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁵ In determining whether to

¹ ECF No. 1-1 (complaint).

² ECF No. 8 (order).

3 *Id.*

⁴ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁵ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with
 2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious
 3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
 4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
 5 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
 7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
 8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
 9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
 10 prosecuting an action.⁷ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
 11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
 12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁸ Houston was warned that his
 13 case would be dismissed without prejudice if he failed to update his address within 30 days.⁹ So,
 14 Houston had adequate warning that his failure to update his address would result in this case's
 15 dismissal.

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21

22 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
 23 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

24 ⁶ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
 25 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

26 ⁷ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

27 ⁸ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

28 ⁹ ECF No. 4 (order).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without prejudice based on Houston's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this court's August 11, 2020, order; and

The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE.

Dated: October 28, 2020

U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey